

To: "Steve Chen" <steve@youtube.com>
From: "Maryrose Dunton" <maryrose@youtube.com>
Cc: "heather gillette" <heather@youtube.com>, "Micah Schaffer" <micah@youtube.com>, "Hurley Chad" <chad@youtube.com>
Bcc:
Received Date: 2006-01-31 19:39:37 CST
Subject: Re: takedown script

Alright, so currently you can not reject a video specifically as copyrighted. Do we want to add two new actions to the admin tool:

Reject - Copyright
Strike - Copyright

We could send something simple to the copyright owner with a link to our DMCA policy and counter notification instructions. We would send a slightly 'escalated' notification for a 2nd strike.

"Your video [insert video name] has been rejected for copyright infringement. If you feel you are the legal content owner of this video and have been falsely accused of copyright infringement, you may file a DMCA counter notification."

On Jan 31, 2006, at 3:02 AM, Steve Chen wrote:

> Ah ha. I see what you're saying.

>

> Maryrose, can we get someone to implement a thing to send out a
> standard copyrights infringement thing to the users when their
> video is rejected for copyright reasons? I think we should also
> rope in the folks at Wilson Sonsini for clearance on the notice we
> send to these users?

>

> -s

>

> On Jan 30, 2006, at 3:01 PM, heather gillette wrote:

>

>> Yeah this system is better, but we are not messaging at all to the
>> users

>> what they are doing wrong. I've found that the responses I get to
>> the

>> takedown email when I send it are that of clueless-ness and when I
>> don't

>> send it, I get many emails to support where they just don't

>> understand why

>> their videos was rejected. Isn't it better to keep the user and

>> have them

>> become a good user, than to delete and remove a user the

>> unknowingly was

>> doing something wrong?

>>

>> Also, this takedown notice is what we are supposed to do under the

>> DMCA, in

>> addition to it being a valuable message that deters future uploads.

>>
>> Heather
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Steve Chen [mailto:steve@youtube.com]
>> Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 2:55 PM
>> To: heather gillette
>> Cc: 'Micah Schaffer'
>> Subject: Re: takedown script
>>
>> Yup, let's set this meeting up. To the latter point, aren't we
>> forcing people to confirm email addresses and we can use the 3-
>> strikes system to prevent them from using the system again?
>>
>> -s
>>
>> On Jan 30, 2006, at 2:41 PM, heather gillette wrote:
>>
>>> Steve,
>>>
>>> Attached is the email I send to the users whose WWE or ROH videos
>>> have been
>>> deleted so you can see.
>>>
>>> I think your point about 'Matt Dancing' brings up another point
>>> that video
>>> rejections should be reversible or at least there should be some
>>> control or
>>> intelligence built in so that if a really popular video is about
>>> to be
>>> rejected there is a popup that says, 'this video has been viewed
>>> 20,000
>>> times, are you sure you want to reject?' this way we have some
>>> safeguards in
>>> place and we can feel free to build other tools to help ease the
>>> manual
>>> process that we have now in rejecting videos for copyright.
>>>
>>> Bottom line, the system that we have now is painful and we are not
>>> preventing users from uploading more copyrighted videos because we
>>> are not
>>> messaging what they have done wrong, or if we are, I am manually
>>> sending the
>>> warning emails explaining what they have done wrong. Could we get
>>> together
>>> and brainstorm what everyone's needs and fears are? This way we
>>> can all
>>> come to a final compromise and hopefully get some improved tools/
>>> automation
>>> in the pipeline?
>>>
>>> I think the following people need to meet to discuss this:
>>>
>>> Maryrose
>>> Micah
>>> Heather
>>> Brent
>>> Steve

>>>
>>> Thanks!
>>>
>>> Heather
>>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Steve Chen [mailto:steve@youtube.com]
>>> Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2006 4:40 PM
>>> To: heather gillette
>>> Cc: 'Micah Schaffer'
>>> Subject: Re: takedown script
>>>
>>> Is it a generic Cease & Desist letter that we sent to all infringing
>>> parties? Or is it tailored to the specific case/companies in
>>> question?
>>>
>>> We can build this, it's not very difficult to do.
>>>
>>> After finding out one of our most popular videos (matt dancing) was
>>> accidentally removed from the system, I'm getting increasingly more
>>> worried about limiting access for people to reject videos. With the
>>> interns coming in, we're essentially granting these interns on their
>>> first days a way to remove every video on the system. Furthermore,
>>> we have no system of record that tracks who did what in the system.
>>> Lastly, we have no way of correcting this problem.
>>>
>>> That's why I'm very reluctant to make rejecting videos 1) easier or
>>> 2) more automated for mass rejections.
>>>
>>> I don't know what the final solution will look like but whatever it
>>> is, I know it must include a more robust "checks & balances" system
>>> implemented as some kind of tiered approval process where to mass
>>> reject videos, it's not as easy as any one of the 15 folks with
>>> admin
>>> access to go in and type a search word and hitting a button.
>>>
>>> -s
>>>
>>> On Jan 27, 2006, at 11:42 AM, heather gillette wrote:
>>>
>>>> Just to clarify, 'Cease and Desist' is what the WWE and ROH refers
>>>> to when
>>>> they talk about the warning email we send. I am used to referring
>>>> to it as
>>>> such because this is the terminology they use.
>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: heather gillette [mailto:heather@youtube.com]
>>>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 11:39 AM
>>>> To: 'Micah Schaffer'; 'Steve Chen'
>>>> Subject: RE: takedown script
>>>>
>>>> To further reiterate what Micah says below, the companies that are
>>>> requesting that we remove these copyrighted videos are also
>>>> requesting that
>>>> we send Cease and Desist letter to the users who have uploaded
>>>> these videos.
>>>> Because we do not give the companies the user info they are unable

>>>> to send
>>>> these Cease and Desist notifications to the infringer themselves.
>>>> That
>>>> being said, it is a manual process sending this notification to
>>>> each of the
>>>> infringers and it would be much more efficient if this notification
>>>> was
>>>> built into the admin tool and the email notification, via a
>>>> differentiation
>>>> that the video was removed for copyright infringement rather than
>>>> porn.
>>>>
>>>> Heather
>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: Micah Schaffer [mailto:micah@youtube.com]
>>>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 11:27 AM
>>>> To: Steve Chen
>>>> Cc: heather gillette
>>>> Subject: Re: takedown script
>>>>
>>>> When we're flagging 100+ DMCA'd URLs, it's difficult to flag them
>>>> all in
>>>> the admin interface when they are mixed in with user-flagged-porn
>>>> that
>>>> needs to be reviewed (the problem is compounded by having multiple
>>>> people using the admin tool). But most importantly, we need to be
>>>> able
>>>> to send a different automated warning email to copyright violators
>>>> than
>>>> everyone else.. they need information on what they are doing wrong
>>>> and
>>>> they need to be told about the counter notice process.
>>>>
>>>> Micah
>>>>
>>>> Steve Chen wrote:
>>>>> Micah --
>>>>>
>>>>> I'm not sure why this is necessary? Let me know if I'm
>>>>> misunderstanding
>>>>> the situation, but it seems to me, the reasons in the drop-down
>>>>> that
>>>>> show up on the flag video page serves only as customer-facing eye
>>>>> candy. When we see it from our admin portal, the result is that
>>>>> it'll
>>>>> be approved or rejected (variations thereof). Furthermore, if
>>>>> I see
>>>>> it's flagged from an admin user, I will pay attention to it even
>>>>> more...
>>>>>
>>>>> -s
>>>>>
>>>>> On Jan 23, 2006, at 12:42 PM, Micah Schaffer wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> While we're at it, we should consider adding a value for
>>>>>> 'copyright'
>>>>>> to the 'reason' variable in flag_video. Not to be accessible to

```
>>>>> users,  
>>>>> just admins.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>> <takedown.txt>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>
```
